

M. R. HOLSINGER & CO.,

"LEAVING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST, LET US GO ON UNTO PERFECTION."

\$2.00 per Annum in Advance.

ASHLAND, O., WEDNESDAY, DEC. 12, 1883.

NO. 49.

SALVATION ONLY BY GRACE THROUGH FAITH.

This is the faith we humbly seek,
The faith in thy all-cleansing blood;
The faith that doth for sinners speak,
O let it speak us up to God.

BEECHER, EVOLUTION, SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE

Being a Reply to Henry Ward Beecher's California Lectures.

BY PROF. J. A. MILLER, D. D., M. D.

“He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just : but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.”—Prov. 18 : 17.

(Continued.)

If I mistake not, it was in 1856 that Dr. Bement informed the "Geological Society of America," that providing the matter of which the various geological strata of our earth was composed, could be pulverized and placed in water, it would settle in its present geological order in a very short time. To test the proposition, and of course to demonstrate its fallacy, fragments of the various strata were taken, pulverized, placed in a glass jar filled with water, and the whole well adjutated, or shaken up together. The consternation of the representatives of this society may be imagined, but not described, when it was found, that following the natural laws of affinity, as controlled by cohesion and attraction, this entire conglomerate mass had settled in its exact geological order as found in the strata of the earth, inside the short period of *Twenty-four hours*. Moses had previously, distinctly informed us, that this earth was formed in water. If so, it did not require millions of ages for it to obtain its present formation, not even "six days". Omnipotence could have used secondary agencies and produced it just as it is, complete in all its stratification, in the short period of twenty-four hours. The next objection we may expect Beecher to urge will be, that the Mosiac account is false, because the time it gives is *too long*, instead of *too short*.

I will just add, that every one of these supposed geological difficulties respecting stratification, crystallization, fossil remains and animal tribes, from the Mollusk up to the Mastodon are all capable of just as easy and satisfactory solution; and their solution only brings forward from geology itself, as might have been expected, additional testimony to corroborate the veracity of the Bible and demonstrate the correctness of the Mosaic account of creation, and in doing so, makes its inspiration an absolute necessity. Churches and ministers, have been too ready to concede as facts, the mere assumptions of great names, and high authority; and then, by "construction" of Bible language, seek to harmonize revelation with these assumptions. Oh! "Let God be true but every man a liar." Rom. 3:4. Beecher then speaks of "one day, two days, three days" of creation, as if "Deity needed rest." He evidently forgets that all creative acts commenced and ended, with direct reference to the ease, benefit, comfort and happiness, of His prospective creature man. It was for poor Beecher that Deity said, "The evening and the morning was the first day." It was because his weary *child*, would need rest, that day and night indicated the order of creative acts; and not omnipotence. Shame on the professed Christian minister who can stoop to misrepresent and then make light of the kindest acts of his father's God; and trifle with the most sacred interests of his fellow man. I wonder, did Beecher's audience observe, that as a witness for evolution, he testified to nothing. As the advocate of evolution, he introduced no testimony. But with the assumed dignity of exalted station, he asserted everything, and there it rests, on his *ipsi dixit* and on that alone. And on that he asked his California audiences to find a verdict against the Bible and in favor of evolution.

One thing he asserted, however, which is true; and that is: "That Christianity is not going to be injured in any way by the expo-

nents of evolution." And I may ask, why not? Professor Hæckel of the university of Jena, Germany, is an advocate of evolution, and he labors through two large folio volumes to ignore, and deny the existence of Deity, and to establish "spontaneous generation." The world to-day rings with Huxley's, Spencer's and Beecher's denials of inspiration; poisoning the minds of our youth, and as far as in them lies shaking confidence in the authority of the book of God, the very foundation of Christianity. And then to calm our fears, as preparatory for fresh attacks he complacently tells us "Christianity is not going to be injured by the advocates of evolution." A highwayman demands your money or your life; but to calm your agitation says, "I am not going to injure you, just hand over your money or your life." So with these men, they will, if possible, destroy confidence in the Bible, and use so called Christian ministers to do it, and then mock us by saying they won't "injure Christianity." What an undesigned acknowledgement of the innate weakness of error, even when upheld and propagated by grant minds! Why will the advocates of evolution not injure Christianity? Why? Because its foundation is laid in the eternal nature of God, and its development is so beneficial to man, that its pyramidal towers and adamantine buttresses are invulnerable to all the assaults of earth and hell. That is why. But Beecher fails to tell us so. And in the very next breath tells us: "Evolution is a disturbing evidence." But if so, we may rest easy, for it is not going to "injure Christianity." In fact it being one of the "sciences falsely so called;" it is important, and harmless, and is only used by Beecher as a gilded toy out of which to make money. He only dresses up the dead carcass of evolution, with the beauties of language, and perfumes it with the fragrance of eloquence, and carries it around for public exhibition at one dollar a sight, and if you are alarmed, he don't tell you it is dead; and stuffed, but he assures you it is harmless, it won't injure. It is only plausible in theory; it is false in fact, and few know it better than Beecher. For since Wilford Hall of New York published his "*Problem of Human Life, Here and Hereafter*," and sent a copy gratuitously to the leading evolutionists of the world; there has not since, a single line emanated from the pen of a single evolutionist in its defense. The very foundation on which it rested was overturned, and the whole superstructure demolished, and its leading advocates silenced forever. They are too judicious to risk a future reputation on such an exploded bubble. But it answers just as well for Beecher's purpose, as anything else, so he makes \$500 per night out of it. When however, he "avered" as a man of truth and honor, that there were no signs of declining faith in the scientific world as to evolution;" he "avered" what he knew as false, or else his ignorance is pitiable indeed.

As to his views of the "inspiration of the Bible," I have in mercy to Beecher but one remark to make. When he was ordained to the Christian ministry, in conformity with the usages of the church of his choice; he promised before God, angels, men, and devils, to preach the atonement, enforce the commandments, and defend the inspiration of the scriptures to the utmost of his ability; these vows are still upon him! Heaven pity him, for the manner in which he is carrying them out! When may we suppose did Beecher tell the truth, when he swore to defend, or when he stooped to attack. He can again poise on which ever horn of this dilemma of his own creation he pleases.

As to the origin of man, no! that is not it, I will put it in his own words—"the unfolding of man," he says: "It is not yet proved that he unfolded from the inferior animals, it is not yet even a universal scientific belief," * * * "But I believe it." Now, if it is not yet proven, and Beecher says himself it is not, why, in the name of common sense, does he make the attempt to force it on the people of California as a "science." "A science not yet proved," not even a "Universal Scientific belief." Consequently a mere hypothesis, an assumption, a speculation, an assertion, called a "science," the highest attainable knowledge on the subject. Something the scientific world don't even believe in; but Beecher says: "*I believe it.*" "*I,*" H. W. Beecher, "*believe it,*" and as I believe it,

it don't matter to you ignoramuses of California that the scientific world don't believe it. If "I believe it," you can accept it as a fact on my faith. A meaner insult was never tendered an intelligent people, who paid \$1.00 each to obtain it.

He then tells us the earliest animals were "eggs, cells, germs," and that they "slowly changed their forms." How does he know? In those early times, his embryonic forces lay ~~concealed~~ in Haeckel's *monera*, if evolution is true—an unconscious lump of "Albumen." And as he cannot demonstrate it now, he took no cognizance of it then. And as he is perjured in the one case, we question his statement in the other.

He tells us Haeckel is an Atheist. Haeckel tells us his *monera* is a lump of albumen, and this lump of albumen is the egg cell, the ancestral form of the species. Vol. 1, p 186. Now from the identical teachings of both Beecher and Haeckel will any living logician, with a literary microscope of ten thousand diameters, point out the difference between Haeckel the German Atheist, and Henry Ward Beecher, the Brooklyn pastor. If Haeckel's views of evolution stamp him as an Atheist, and they do, how does it effect the Brooklyn pastor when he uses Haeckel's exact terms to express his ideas, and endorses them as his own? He shrinks from Haeckel's conclusions because it is unpopular, and then adds cowardice to Haeckel's sin of Atheism.

Beecher then refers to what he is pleased to call a "curious fact," and that is that Professor Dana, and Asa Gray of Harvard University, are evolutionists, and yet are both good Christian gentlemen. I see nothing "curious" about that, when we remember that his Satanic majesty "is transformed into an angel of light." What is to hinder these men doing like Beecher does, "wear the livery of heaven to serve the devil in?" He might have added Joseph Cook, Dr. McCosh, President Seely, &c., &c. But what does this prove in favor of evolution? Verily nothing, except that Beecher is not alone in his folly. These men attempt to insert in Darwin and Haeckel's system of evolution, what they suppose is a Christianizing proviso, which sanctifies evolution, and enables them to hold to both Christianity, and evolution. They remind me of the ignorant hibernian who in a storm at sea prayed a while to the good Lord and then to the good devil; when afterwards asked why he did so, replied, as he was going to a strange country and not knowing whose hands he would fall into, he wanted to be on the good side of both. So with these men they are afraid evolution may lose by science, so they embrace evolution losing their reputation, and Christianity for fear they may lose their souls.

These believers in evolution do not accept the doctrine by saying that there can be no evolution without an agency; hence they add, "That if God should finally be established, it is scientifically shown to have been the result of carrying on the consummation of creation, through the action of which and in the operation of which . . . each successive transitional variation, of the forms, up to man, are exercised in a successive and gradual evolution. And they affirm that this a brilliant proviso differs so far from Darwin's designing, his transmutation and Huxley's spontaneous generation as to render it consistent with Christian theism." It would really seem that these learned men had lost their wisdom in the unfathomed labyrinth of schools, if they would certainly see that this supposed proviso, is still simple, pure, unadulterated Darwinism. Darwin's hypothesis is "That the first few simple beings formed the basis of evolution, and that out of them, the myriad species, up to man, have been evolved by natural selection, and that this natural selection was the special work of creative energy and intelligence; requiring the miraculous intervention of the creation; who breathed into them not only the life and mental power, which constituted them living beings, but who necessarily incorporated in that such vital force and mental potentiality, to enable them to transfer the same to other beings with compound and complex interest. Thus Darwin's first animal forms are made God's vicegerants in originating all other species, or else God, personally, superintending

all succeeding transmutations; and this is the essence of this "Christian Proviso," fuled by Darwin himself, but paraded by these fine Christian gentlemen, who failing to find a philosophical answer to Darwin's facts have tried in this lame way, to save a fraction of the Bible by almost getting down on their knees to evolutionists. And this is what gives rise to Beecher's theory of "construc-tion." He would construe the Bible so as to harmonize with Darwin and Haeckel's evo-lution. The one, atheism, the other panthe-ism; and he being anything, or nothing, as the case may be, would so construe it as to make it harmonize with the paradoxes of geology, the Atheism of Haeckel, the Pan-theism of Darwin, or the satire of Ingersoll. It was popular or there was money in it for Henry Ward Beecher. How he and such men as Asa Gray can claim with Haeckel an Atheist, that all species were developed by natural selection without a supervising in-telligence from one initial form, and at the same time believe, and subscribe to the Xi-cene creed and the New Testament, is a mystery without a parallel even in the fabled science of Mythology. Look for one moment at what such a belief involves. It involves the belief that Jesus Christ was the son of God on his father's side, and the son of a monkey on his mother's side. But I forbear to further expose a thought so repulsive to the refined feelings of every intelligent Chris-tian and at such repugnant variance with the essential physical purity of Christ himself.

Darwin admits and deplores the missing link, which connects man with the lower order of animals, and apprehends it can never be found; and in this, admits his hypothesis can never be a science, but must always remain an assumption. Beecher, on the other hand says: "Far back can be traced the connection between the man and the monkey, but each has taken his separate course of development." When, where, how "far" back can this connection be traced? As a pretended scientist Beecher should have told us; failing to do this we are left to the tender mercies of Darwin, who numerically to Beecher, says, "The missing link cannot be found which connects man with the monkey." Thus the author of the Theory contradicts his Brooklyn pupil, and brands him as an unflinching perverter of essential facts. Darwin recognized the fact that this missing link could not be found, no traces of it could be found in the histology of the race; it could not be distorted from fossil remains, or in the history of the world as it is, and by no conceivable stretch of imagination can it be written from any arbitrary system of evolution. There exists in the history of imagination of this Brooklyn Doctor, and some, which polished, and dignified, and softened his Theory, failed in, for he could not transcend and transcend 5500 years, and a "New Genesis." His illustrative and ornamental and digressive demonstration, no matter his theory of evolution, is a scientific and dogmatic, or hereditary, or scientific, or by pathos, or by culture? or by common sense, or by any way.

"The origin of the origin of the Mosaic
 legend is that 'God made man out of the
 dust of the earth,' being borrowed from the
 fact that the 'monopods' imaginary men out
 of mud were a 'species.' So, a conception
 might be deemed worthy of the intellect of
 this Breecher, even, but it would be infinitely
 beneath the generative of the mind that wrote
 Genesis. But even Huxley, in his theory of
 "spontaneous generation" has to take "mud,"
 if you please, for the origin of his monera;
 and this monera becomes the progenitor of all
 the species. So God may, as well have
 made Beecher out of mud direct, as to have
 made a monera out of "mud"; then a monkey
 out of the monera; and Beecher out of the
 monkey. So according to his own statement,
 he don't escape the conclusion, he simply
 shifts its process. Poor Beecher after all is
 made of "mud," and I fear of poor Adoba at
 that.

(To be Continued.)

THE BRETHREN'S ANNUAL FOR 1884

Contains biographical sketches and portraits of Elders John H. Lusted and Frederick P. Loehr, a chronological department of the Brethren Church, and of the German Baptist and Old Order churches, besides much other useful and interesting reading matter.

Price 20 cents, or \$2.00 per dozen. Order soon. Address
H. R. Holsinger and Co., Ashland, Ohio.